

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 LISA MESSANO,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS,  
11 INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-05697-HSG](#)

**ORDER DENYING JOINT MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE**

Re: Dkt. No. 28

12 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42 permits a court to consolidate actions if they “involve a  
13 common question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42. “The district court has broad discretion  
14 under this rule to consolidate cases pending in the same district.” *Inv’rs Research Co. v. U.S. Dist.*  
15 *Court for Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 877 F.2d 777, 777 (9th Cir. 1989). In considering a motion to  
16 consolidate, a court “weighs the saving of time and effort consolidation would produce against any  
17 inconvenience, delay, or expense that it would cause.” *Huene v. United States*, 743 F.2d 703, 704  
18 (9th Cir.), *on reh’g*, 753 F.2d 1081 (9th Cir. 1984). Here, Defendants Experian Information  
19 Solutions, Inc. and Equifax, Inc. have jointly moved for the Court to consolidate more than 170  
20 similar suits filed by Plaintiff’s counsel and alleging violations of state and federal credit reporting  
21 laws. Dkt. No. 28. On balance, the Court finds that any efficiency gained by having a single  
22 judge hear the suits would be outweighed by the delay that would result from burdening a single  
23 judge’s chambers with over 170 cases—on top of its existing caseload. Accordingly, the Court  
24 **DENIES** the joint motion to consolidate.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 Dated: 1/4/2017

27  
28   
HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge